

SN 10/742,127

#### REMARKS

Applicant and Applicants attorney thanks the Examiner in charge of this case for the courtesy of the telephone interviews on this allowed case. This amendment includes the points discussed in the telephone interviews, is believed to present straight forward amendments and to present no new issues.

The Notice of Allowance mailed 1/11/06 is gratefully acknowledged. The Notice of Allowability accompanying the said Notice of Allowance cancels Claims 4-6, 9, 14, 16 and 54-56. Applicant agrees with the cancellation of Claim 9, but respectfully requests entry of the other cancelled claims, with minor changes in some. This will be discussed below and is consonant with the telephone discussions with the Examiner.

Applicant respectfully believes that the claims resubmitted herewith are in fact covered by the generic claims from which they depend.

Claim 4. This claim is drawn to a non-elected species (Figs. 5a-d, 6a-c, 10a-b) which all Show the spoke as assembled to the hub. Claim 4 is believed to be covered by generic Claim 1 from which said Claim 1 depends. The embodiments covered by said Claim 4 are all believed to be responsive to the language in generic Claim 1 that spoke movement in the axial and tangential directions is prevented.

Claim 5. This claim is also drawn to a non-elected species of Figs. 5a-d and 6a-c, so

SN 10/742,127

that the points above with respect to Claim 4 are believed to be appropriate.

Claim 6. This claim has been amended to depend from allowed Claim 2 in order to clarify the propriety of allowance of Claim 6 in this case. This claim is shown in detail in Fig. 3d and is believed to be applicable to all embodiments. The reinforcement element is a bearing race (13) shown in Fig. 3d. However, it should be noted that the elected embodiment of Figs. 4a-f clearly shows a bearing bore (7) that is intended to receive a bearing race.

Claim 9. As indicated above, Applicant agrees with the cancellation of this claim.

Claim 14. This claim depends from allowed Claim 1 and it is believed is covered by the generic claim. In the discussions with the Examiner it is believed that the Examiner agreed with the allowance of this claim.

Claim 16. This claim also depends from allowed Claim 1 and is believed to be covered thereby. This claim is drawn to the non-elected embodiment of Fig. 7 and is believed to be responsive to the language in generic Claim 1 that spoke movement in the axial and tangential directions is prevented.


SN 10/742,127

Claim 54. This claim depends from Claim 6, which has been discussed above. It is submitted that this claim is clearly covered by the generic claim.

Claims 55-56. These claims both depend from Claim 1 and are believed to be covered thereby. In the discussions with the Examiner it is believed that the Examiner agreed with the allowance of these claims.

Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration by the Examiner. No new issues are being presented and the reintroduction of these dependent claims is believed to be proper. In addition, no fee is believed to be required here as no claims are added.

Respectfully submitted,

  
RAPHAEL SCHLANGER  
Tel: 203-778-4711  
Fax: 203-798-8240

Date: March 14, 2006